

Copy to - H. WELLS-RG

(Transcription of Letter to Editor of 3-30-95)

From The Dallas Morning News, March 30, 1994

OSWALD A PATSY

Can you explain why whenever your paper has a story that mentions Lee Harvey Oswald, he is referred to as "presidential assassin," when in fact he was never convicted and there is overwhelming evidence that he was just as he said, "a patsy"?

Scott Ulick
Carrollton



Oswald was the assassin

Re: Scott Ulick's letter,
March 30, "Oswald a patsy."

I was an on-the-spot eyewitness to the assassination of President John Kennedy. I am clearly visible in the crowd in the famous Zapruder film. I have studied the Warren Commission report and hundreds of other writings related to JFK's

murder. It is very pathetic that Mr. Ulick and others refuse to do their "homework" and sort fact from fiction.

There has been at least seven separate investigations of varying degrees into the assassination and related events. Not one of those investigations has found any credible evidence that Lee Harvey Oswald was in

any way connected with any other person or organization. An in-depth study of Mr. Oswald's life would, I think, convince Mr. Ulick that no one in their right mind would have trusted Mr. Oswald even slightly!

The Dallas Morning News is correct in stating that "Oswald was the presidential assassin," even though he did not live to be lawfully adjudged guilty. The seven investigations were much more thorough and complete than any one [trial] could possibly have been.

I surmise that Mr. Ulick has seen the movie *JFK* and obviously believes it was accurate and factual — how sad!

It seems to me that Mr. Ulick has been "brainwashed" and he is the real "patsy" for the conspiracy theorists. I challenge Mr. Ulick to seriously study the facts in the *JFK* murder!

ERNEST C. BRANDT,
Dallas

Sounds like a "plant."

(Letter to Editor of 4-18-95)